

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,179	09/15/2003	Jerald C. Seelig	619.489 ACC.CIP-Bingo Nig	1427
21707 7:	590 07/07/2005		EXAMINER	
IAN F. BURN	IS & ASSOCIATES		LAYNO, B	ENJAMIN .
P.O. BOX 7111	15			
RENO, NV 8	89570		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	3711	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		W.	フ _.
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Comments	10/663,179	SEELIG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin H. Layno	3711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	h the correspondence address	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. FHS from the mailing date of this communicat ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.
Status	•		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02	May 2005.		
	nis action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice under	<i>Ex part</i> e Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ad	ccepted or b) \square objected to	y the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	• •
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the l	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/03/05.)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/663,179 Page 2

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1m 5-20, 25-32, 36-43, 45,47, 51 and 53-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

- 2. Claims 1, 5-19, 32, 36-43, 45, 47 and 51 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 22-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,817,945 in view of Rivero.
- 3. The Applicant is referred to the first Office action mailed 2/16/05.
- 4. The patent to Rivero disclose a gaming device comprising a gaming device housing 1, a rotatable cage-like display container 2, a plurality of moveable objects 17 inside the rotatable cage-like display container, and an actuator (motor) configured to rotate the cage-type display container. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to modify the rotatable display container of U.S. Patent No. 6, 817,945 such that it forms a rotatable cage-type display. This modification would have made the gaming device of U.S. Patent No. 6, 817,945 look more like a lottery game, and thereby attract lottery players.
- 5. Claims 20 and 25-31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 29-39 of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,678 in view of Rivero. The patent to Rivero disclose a gaming device comprising a gaming device housing 1, a rotatable cage-like display container 2, a plurality of moveable objects 17 inside the rotatable cage-like display container, and an

Application/Control Number: 10/663,179 Page 3

Art Unit: 3711

actuator (motor) configured to rotate the cage-type display container. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to modify the rotatable display container of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,678 such that it forms a rotatable cage-type display container. This modification would have made the gaming device of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,678 look more like a lottery game, and thereby attract lottery players.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glasson et al. in view of Rivero.
- 8. The Applicant is referred to Glasson et al. in the first Office action. Glasson discloses a video image of a bingo ball container, and recites "an animation of bingo balls being mixed in a barrel-like container", paragraph [0041]. Furthermore, Glasson gaming device discloses a controller 36, and a controller selectable object 48 in communication with the controller. The controller selectable object 48 is displayed to the player as video image of a number corresponding to a bingo ball that was selected from the barrel-like container. Thus, the controller selectable object 48 is substantially similar in appearance to the bingo balls in the barrel-like container. Thus giving the illusion that the controller selectable object 48 is one of the bingo balls from the barrel-

Application/Control Number: 10/663,179

Art Unit: 3711

like container. Glasson also discloses a game display 58-62 in communication with the controller. The game display comprises a plurality of display positions representing bingo cards. The bingo cards clearly have a matrix of cells formed in rows and columns. Each cell is correlated to a display position, wherein the controller is configured to select a bingo ball, the display symbol or number on the selected bingo ball is displayed on the game display until either a row, a column or a diagonal of the matrix is filled with display symbols or numbers, paragraphs [0041] – [0043]. In a primary game a player may select one bingo card 58-62 to play the game. A bonus game may be provided if a player chooses more than one bingo card, paragraph [0007].

Page 4

- 9. The patent to Rivero disclose a gaming device comprising a gaming device housing 1, a mechanically rotatable cage-like display container 2, a plurality of moveable objects 17 inside the rotatable cage-like display container, and an actuator (motor) configured to rotate the cage-type display container. Also, rotatable cage-like display containers are well known in the bingo games.
- 10. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to modify Glasson's barrel-like container such that it is in the form of a mechanical or video image of rotatable cage-like display container. The mechanical rotatable cage-like display container would have been horizontally mounted inside Glasson's gaming device, and would have been rotated by a motor. Using a clutch, a flange connected to the rotatable cage-type display, and a belt in communication with the motor would have been an obvious and well-known means of driving the rotatable cage-like display container. The rotating motion of the cage-like display container agitates the moveable objects or bingo balls.

Application/Control Number: 10/663,179 Page 5

Art Unit: 3711

This modification would have made Glasson's gaming apparatus look more like a bingo game, and thereby attracting bingo players. Determining the shape of the rotatable cage-like display container (e.g. sphere, cylinder, etc.) would have simply been an aesthetic design choice, which is always obvious in the art. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide an attraction mode wherein the rotatable cage-like display container continues to rotate when no active game is being conducted in Glasson's gaming device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 12. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The "at least one rod" is not recited in the specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin H. Layno whose telephone number is (571) 272-4424. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 1st Friday Off.

Art Unit: 3711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on (571)272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Senjamin H. Layno Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

bhl